DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 091 FL 017 735

AUTHOR Carver, David
TITLE Appropriate Methodology for INSET in ELT.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (22nd, Edinburgh, Scotland, April 11-14, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Cultural Awareness; Curriculum Development; *Developing Nations; *Educational Innovation; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; Second Language Instruction; Teacher Education Curriculum; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS England

ABSTRACT

Discusses the design and content of British in-service teacher education courses for non-native-English-speaking teachers of English from developing countries. Focus is on the methodology appropriate for this group of teachers. It is argued that such courses must emphasize the concept of communicative methodology, but must also address the problems inherent in this methodology for teachers from developing countries. A taxonomy of barriers to innovation in this population is outlined. It includes management problems, perceptions of appropriate teaching and learning strategies, perceptions of culturally appropriate roles for teachers and learners, teacher fears and anxieties, intellectual doubts about theory and policy, limited professional competence, and limited linguistic competence. A model of in-service teacher education methodology is proposed. This model arises from the tension between advances in methodological theory and the constraints operating in the teacher's own situation. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302091

Appropriate Methodology for INSET in ELT

David Carver

ABSTRACT

The issue addressed is the kind of methodology which is appropriate for UK-based inservice courses to offer to ELT practitioners from developing countries. It is argued that such courses must foreground the concept of communicative methodology, but that it would be unrealistic to ignore the problems posed by such a methodological development to teachers from developing countries. A taxonomy of such problems is reviewed. A model of INSET methodology is proposed which arises from the tension between advances in methodological theory and the constraints operating in the teacher's own situation.

Paper presented at the 22nd International Conference of IATEFL/TESOL
11-14 April, 1988, University of Edinburgh, Scotland

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Carver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 017 735

DJC/CCD
DOC045/18B

APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY FOR INSET IN ELT

In this paper I want to discuss the question of the design and content of UK-based courses aimed at practising teachers of English from developing countries. Such courses are very widely available in Britain, and the British Council is responsible for placing hundreds of scholarship holders on these courses every year.

In-service teacher education courses (INSET) serve a range of purposes but three in particular can be identified:

a) to bring untrained or undertrained serving teachers to an agreed level of professional competence

b) to provide training to enable teachers to implement a specific innovation or curriculum project

c) to provide opportunity for professional development in a more general sense.

Many INSET courses in the teachers' home countries are of types a) or b). A few based in the UK are of type b).

Most UK-based courses however are of type c). The reasons for this are easy to see:

a) teachers awarded scholarships for study in the UK are more likely to be actual or potential high fliers, than they are to be teachers needing basic upgrading.

b) such scholarship holders are most likely to arrive in ones and twos, rather than in large groups, and they are likely to be placed in heterogeneous groups of teachers from a range of different countries.

c) most importantly, upgrading and project related training is unlikely to be successful if conducted out of the context in which the teachers work.

In the majority of cases, it is most probable that at the time of writing, such course members will be presented with a course which gives prominence to the 'communicative approach' in one way or another.

Recent years have seen the middle ground of ELT methodology occupied by the 'communicative approach', however this is interpreted, and a corresponding large scale production of course material which has found a ready market in the adult and further education sectors. While there have been rival and alternative formulations of approaches to language teaching, it is undoubtedly true to say that the communicative approach is the dominant paradigm, and one which impinges on all sectors of the ELT profession. The few remonstrances which have emerged from the field (Swann; Medgyes) have seemed to be isolated and unprogressive. Nevertheless, it is here contended that the few published expressions of dissent represent a considerable degree of unease and even resistance among teachers at the grassroots level for teacher trainers working with teachers from developing countries, this unease is sometimes only too apparent.

Reports from the field of teachers using communicative methodology are not easy to find. In this paper I summarise a small range of published reports and I attempt to draw certain conclusions.

Ahrens (1986) identifies a number of anecdotal reactions in India to proposals for change towards more communicative methodology. These include:

a) teachers haven't got time for games

b) teachers have to get through the syllabus

c) classrooms can't be rearranged for group work

d) pupils make too much noise

e) teachers do not have enough time or resources to prepare materials for communicative activities.

Ahrens suggests that reactions of type a) differ fundamentally from the other types, which are basically issues of management, and are, therefore, perhaps amenable to management solutions. The first kind of reaction however is based on a view of how people learn languages, and so is not amenable to solution without a change of perception on the part of teachers.

Nolasco and Arthur (1986) suggest that teachers are often resistant or even hostile to suggested communicative innovations, often on the basis of single isolated attempts to try communicative techniques in their own classrooms. Problems adduced by such teachers tend to be of the kind described by Ahrens as management problems. Like Ahrens, Nolasco and Arthur describe brief experiment in implementing communicative methodology intended to demonstrate that management problems can be overcome. Like Ahrens, they conclude that the real problem lies in the area of perceptions of teaching and learning. They go on to argue that while teachers are commonly regarded as the source of resistance to change, the way forward may be to work on the **learners'** perceptions, which in turn have a strong effect on teachers' behaviour.

Medgyes (1986) also identifies teachers' perceptions as the source of resistance to change. However, he argues that these perceptions are not necessarily rationally held cognitive views of how language is best learned, and how education is best managed. Instead, these stated perceptions often express fears and anxieties which are an intrinsic part of teachers' experiences as human beings living in the real world. These underlying fears and anxieties rarely surface, because teachers, (perhaps like most people), are clever at keeping a low profile and at shunning overt conflict. Therefore while there may be lip service acceptance of the communicative approach, most teachers feel frustrated and helpless in the face of its demands, but they keep quiet about it.

Bolitho and Early (1981) and Rinvolucri (1981) both give accounts of resistance on the part of teachers which sprang from fears and anxieties of various kinds. In both studies the way forward was seen to lie with a counselling approach on the part of the teacher educator/supervisor.

Both studies mentioned above are located in cultural context in which the communicative approach has developed. Nahara (n.d.) summarises reactions in a rather different setting to the demands of the communicative approach. He includes in his list of difficulties the kind of management issues such as noise, materials, the demands of the syllabus, which we have already considered. In addition, he identifies a cultural dimension to the problem of teacher resistance. In developing countries there may be deeply rooted assumptions about the roles of learners and teachers, and the appropriate behaviour of people of different ages, which may be very difficult for the English teacher to ignore. The writer asks "Can this three years of training overcome the nine years of experience as a student, where the lessons were dominated by the teacher and where the student was a passive recipient?" He concludes by saying "What we see as the

role of the teacher in Communicative Language Teaching demands a lot of change from the teacher and the learner. These ideas originated in societies quite different to ours. They were sold to us as a panacea that will solve our problems. They are very attractive like all fashions. But are they suitable to Mozambique?"

Wigzell (1983) identifies another kind of difficulty when he suggests that the communicative approach, "by encouraging use at the expense of correct usage, may have the effect of accelerating the process of creolization."

Bonamy and Moon (1981) point out that in some situations teachers may lack the requisite professional or linguistic competence to implement the methodology.

On the basis of these somewhat sporadic observations we might attempt to create a taxonomy of barriers to innovation in the direction of communicative methodology:

Type of Constraint

1. Management problems
2. Perceptions of appropriate teaching and learning strategies
   - of teachers
   - of fellow teachers
   - of authorities
   - of parents
   - of society.
3. Perceptions of culturally appropriate roles for teachers and learners.
4. Fears and anxieties of teachers
5. Intellectual doubts about theory and policy.
6. Limited professional competence
7. Limited linguistic competence.

I want to argue that while some of these objections, and others not listed here, could be investigated empirically, the argument is not basically an empirical one at all.

By contrast, I suggest:

a) methodology cannot offer a formula or set of procedures which, if correctly followed, will lead to success;

b) the pursuit of new methods in the hope of finding the best one is of limited value.

c) methodology instead gives the teacher a conceptual framework to work in; in this sense, a method is a means of organising one's action so that one behaves in a consistent and thoughtful way; (this idea of consistent and thoughtful practice is derived from the concept of the reflective practitioner (Schon 1983). Wallace (1987) has provided a seminal article on the relevance of Schon's thinking for ELT practitioners.)

d) one is not free to select any method one wishes; rather, for reasons of personal and social history, one finds oneself working within a particular framework or paradigm.

e) at this time there is probably no viable alternative to the communicative approach as the conceptual framework within which to develop INSET for ELT.

f) management solutions are either unlikely to be forthcoming to the extent that one would hope for in the ideal world, or if present at all, they will require implementation by teachers;

g) most probably, however, various kinds of coping procedures by skilled teachers are the only feasible way out of the constraints imposed by management problems.

Dominance of the Communicative Approach

My first argument for the status of the communicative approach is a sociological one; simply that there is no alternative and it cannot be ignored. By this I mean that it is the current dominant paradigm, which inevitably influences theoretical discussion, materials preparation, assessment procedures, pre- and in-service teacher education. It is in the nature of social processes, that where there is such a dominant paradigm, individuals cannot simply opt out or ignore the paradigm, and institutions find it very difficult to offer and sustain credible alternatives, if indeed they wish to. The very success of a paradigm guarantees its continuing success, while minority views depend for their viability on the commitment of those prepared to work for particular causes. This line of argument is drawn from work in the field of the philosophy of science, in particular that of Kuhn (1970). Kuhn argues that most scientists work within current paradigms of what they take to be well established, which they rarely if ever question. Changes in the paradigm, for instance the change from the physics of Newton to the physics of Einstein, do not come about by a slow process of scientific discovery, but rather by a very rapid change of view of 'ordinary' scientists, who suddenly see that the old paradigm is no longer sufficiently attractive or convincing. The period before such a rapid paradigm shift may be marked by increasing unease and awareness of discrepancies and anomalies in the old paradigm.

My second argument follows the first; the very success of the dominant paradigm has both been built on by, and has promoted, the production of a wealth of theoretical and practical material which teachers and teacher educators can draw on. The adoption of an alternative paradigm would entail turning one's back on these resources, in favour of a much more narrow range of materials. In situations of this kind, the narrower range of materials, while creating and sustaining great loyalty among committed followers of the alternative minority view, may suffer from the fact that it was produced to illustrate an alternative approach, rather than as a contribution to an existing body of literature, and so may display the weaknesses inherent in taking up a committed and entrenched position.

I am not at all arguing that the communicative approach is the final word, or the attainment of the truth after centuries of error. The dominant paradigm may, and almost certainly will change. (Indeed Breen (1987) has persuasively argued that 'the communicative approach' as it is often interpreted is a transitional stage in the emergence of a more radically different process -oriented paradigm). The position taken up in this paper is essentially relativistic. That is to say, I find it intellectually and professionally respectable to argue that truth is not

the issue at all; professional orthodoxy is a social construct, and not a direct product of empirical research. And just as importantly, at any stage of the history of social paradigms, I suggest that what actually happens is almost always a series of compromises and adjustments to the dominant paradigm. A shift in the paradigm, however, seems to come about, not as the result of gradual evolution, but as the result of some destabilisation of the old paradigm. Thus, we can now see clear signs of the communicative approach in the 1960's and earlier, the movement took off in the 1970's following the publication of David Wilkins' **Notional Syllabuses** (1976) and Henry Widdowson's **Teaching Language as Communication** (1977).

One could go on to argue further, as proponents of the communicative approach have done, that the approach contains intrinsic advantages over other models, in giving prominence to such features as the role of the learner, to use and purpose of language, or the significance of content and social setting.

There are features which help to articulate the paradigm and to give it creditability. This is not the same as to claim that they contribute to proving the truth of superiority of the paradigm.

In stepping outside a paradigm, one has to make a conscious effort to suspend judgements about the value of elements within the paradigm. For most of the time, however, one cannot sustain the effort of distancing oneself from the paradigm in which one is most at home.

If the paradigm is really so dominant, why then is there this impression of unease and resistance at the grassroots level? I think that the answer to this question falls into three parts:

a) I suspect that in education at least, if not in science, there is always some degree of discrepancy between a paradigm and the day to day reality or perhaps the point of discrepancy lies between the opinion leaders who act as proponents of the new paradigm, and the grassroots practitioners.

   (Maley (1984) has suggested that opinion-leaders, and most notably syllabus-designers, might contain this kind of unease by using a constraintsmodel approach to syllabus design. I see the concept of constraints as forming an important role in the growth of debate about appropriate methodology for ELT and for ELT-INSET.)

b) the working out of this particular paradigm in terms of procedures has been largely with reference to adult education in a western context; school based education in third world countries has felt the influence of the paradigm but has continued to pursue procedures passed on from earlier paradigms or evolved to meet local circumstances.

c) the nature of education makes it particularly difficult to carry out far-reaching innovation within a relatively short time scale.

Barriers to Innovation

The literature on educational innovation offers a way of focussing on the discrepancy between paradigm and the grassroots. Rogan and Macdonald (1985) summarise evidence from a variety of studies of characteristics of more successful in-service teacher education programmes:

a) **Content**

   i) an exposition of theoretical tenets underpinning the innovation in the form of aims or rationale

ii) modelling or demonstration of teaching skills

iii) feedback from the classroom

b) **Experiential learning**

i) practice of skills in real or simulated settings

ii) sharing of expertise by course participants

c) **Structure**

i) a modular or short course structure

ii) instruction by practising teachers

iii) individualization of training experiences

d) **Support**

i) assistance with re-entry to the professional context

ii) support from authorities and employers.

Joyce and Showers (1980) present a comparable specification of successful INSET. These authors argue that course provision aimed at skill development must include:

a) presentation of theory or description of skill or strategy

b) modelling of skills

c) practice in simulated and real settings

d) structured and open-ended feedback

e) coaching for application.

This model is specifically identified by Avalos (1985) as being appropriate to the needs of teachers in developing countries.

Doyle and Ponder ((1977) provide us with further insights from the standpoint of teachers' perceptions, which in many cases may be said to constitute a hidden paradigm, which Doyle and Ponder refer to as the **practicality ethic.** Teachers, like everybody else, do not judge innovations purely on merit, but instead measure them against their own basic assumptions and attitudes. Doyle and Ponder argue that teachers tend to share assumptions and attitudes based on **practicality.** The reliance on practicality means that:

a) teachers tend to judge innovations by the extent to which they are described in terms of specific procedures

b) teachers also judge innovations by the extent to which these correspond to teachers' own personal experience and feelings about what is appropriate

c) finally, teachers weigh costs of innovation, in terms of effort, time, risk, against their estimation of benefits, such as chances of promotion, recognition, student behaviour.

Duffy and Roehler (1986) show that teachers often have great difficulty in implementing innovation, because of the operation of various constraints:

a) curricular constraints - by which they refer to difficulties encountered by teachers in understanding the underlying rationale of an innovation; therefore they are not able to translate the idea into concrete procedures.

In terms of the Doyle and Ponder model, such teachers are likely to increase their adherence to 'practicality' by demanding specification of classroom techniques, but according to the Rogan and Macdonald analysis, this demand, even if fulfilled, is unlikely to meet with success, if the teachers do not understand the rationale for the techniques.

b) instructional constraints: by which Duffy and Roehler refer to difficulties experienced by teachers in abandoning previous procedures and trying to implement new ones which they are unfamiliar with and do not fully understand.

Again one can see the relationship of this analysis to the Doyle and Ponder cost-benefit concept, and one can also recognise the significance of modelling and phased re-entry in the Rogan and Macdonald model.

c) milieu-related constraints: by which the authors mean the problems associated with the conditions under which teachers work - e.g. class size, grouping patterns, pressures from inspectors, etc.

Here again there is a significant cost-benefit element, and again it seems to me that phased re-entry is the corresponding element of significance in the Rogan and Macdonald model.

d) organisational constraints: these refer to difficulties expressed when teachers are asked to vary their normal routine. "Organizational patterns and routines for getting through the day are, in effect, survival patterns. Innovations which disrupt these routines are resisted." (op cit).

Once again, corresponding concepts from the practicality model and the analysis of successful innovation are not difficult to see.

Brown and McIntryre (1982) however caution us against the assumption that the answer to such problems lies solely in the domain of course design. They argue that innovations can be divided into two types, organizational, and pedagogical. The first type are those which take the form of changes in pattern of organization within an institution or a system; the second type are those which take the form of changes in the attitudes and behaviour of individual teachers. The authors come to the not surprising conclusion: that in certain circumstances it may be possible to create conditions which favour organizational innovation, but that in the case of "those classroom innovations which depend crucially for their implementation on the attitudes of individual teachers, it seems that professional colleagues are almost as powerless as administrative authorities to exert effective pressure on the individual to change his attitudes" (op cit p.49).

Kerry (1985) attempts to put pedagogic innovation within an organizational context when he indicates preconditions for successful innovation in an institution.

a) institutions must develop procedures which are characterised by **openness**

b) these must be procedures which **facilitate innovation**

c) there must be procedures which promote **trust**

d) there must be designated **change agents.**

An Approach to Appropriate Methodology

After this rapid tour of territory lying outside the traditional ELT domain, one is in a better position to understand the position of classroom teachers faced with demands to adopt communicative methodology. We cannot predict in any given case where the difficulties lie, but for designers of teacher education courses it seems important to take into account:

a) how far and in what way the knowledge and skills components of the Rogan and Macdonald model are present in programmes of teacher education

b) whether the Rogan and Macdonald components are supplemented by elements focussing on attitudes, and promoting attitude change

c) how far, if at all, course-design components are supported by organizational components which facilitate successful re-entry of the individual to the classroom, and which also serve to promote innovation and to provide appropriate structures for its implementation.

d) how far and in what way course design promotes teacher-initiated response at the level of coping to the constraints of management problems.

There can be few teacher education programmes which do not provide what is at least an informed guess as to the appropriate mix of theory and practice. Most courses incorporate experiential learning in the form of microteaching, peer teaching, or practice teaching, and most courses make considerable use of the workshop mode, often with some degree of modularization with attention to individual needs of participants. However, it is reasonable to recognize that some of the most interesting and innovative published ELT material was not designed for the third world classroom, and is most unlikely to be implemented with any success in that setting, not least because the material often has considerable requirements for resource provision. Less common is any planned attempt to focus on attitudes in teacher education. Two notable exceptions are reported in Rinvolucri (1981) and in Bolitho and Early (1981). I suggest that the development of professional attitudes offers an area for consistent and thoughtful exploration of what is appropriate within the affective domain. I see likely outcomes of this exploration as relating to the concept of reflective practice (Schon 1983).

Nearly all courses are not able to link to the organizational context at all, and most courses do not address practicality-based issues of congruence, cost-benefit, milieu and organizational-related constraints. Further, it is probably true to say that most ELT course participants in developing countries work in curricular contexts which are not completely committed to innovation, and which impose a variety of severe constraints for a teacher attempting to implement communicative methodology.

So, firstly, we have strong demands from a theoretical position which constitutes the present dominant paradigm.

Secondly, we have analysis of prerequisites for successful training outcomes, some of which prerequisites are unlikely to be met in the near future.

Thirdly, we have a set of physical and attitudinal constraints of the kind analysed by Maley (1984) and reported more anecdotally elsewhere..

Several ways out of this conflict offer themselves.

a) develop an alternative and viable paradigm and develop it in

implementational terms. This solution is attractive, but it may impose heavy costs in terms of staff commitment, and it results in some degree of marginalisation of the institution as a consequence of the decision to move out of the mainstream

b) modify the paradigm and achieve a more 'eclectic' model at the risk of seeming to lack theoretical vigour

c) try to build into the training programme the elements which are missing. Ambitious, but perhaps a lost cause, since what is missing (among other things) is usually control over the organizational context

d) ignore the conflict. Not quite such a bad solution as it might appear.

It removes from the course elements which may not be addressable with any profit, and forces the participant who cares to take up the issues back in the real world. But probably doomed to failure for all but a few brave or naturally innovative course participants.

d) recognize the problem but refer it back to the course participants as a central part of course design and encourage/help them to work out their own solutions. Possibly a pseudo-solution for some since course participants may respond to the encouragement during the course, but revert to the safety of the practicality ethic on return. Nevertheless, this is possibly the only solution which is generalisable for all course providers, and one which offers some possibility of a rational approach to coping with real world constraints within the dominant paradigm.

From this perspective then we might re-examine the taxonomy offered earlier and try to expand it by the addition of a list of types of solution. This taxonomy would then constitute an approach to appropriate methodology for ELT - INSET. (This expression is intentionally ambiguous. I am thinking both of what might be seen as appropriate for direct English teaching, and for the process of continuing teacher education.)

Type of Constraint		Type of Solution
1.	Management problems	(management solutions - not part of INSET provision:
		e.g. facilitation of re-entry from INSET: administration of resourcing and organizational requirements)
		promotion of a problem-solving/coping style of teaching
2.	Perceptions of appropriate teaching and learning strategies	diffusion of knowledge and awareness about alternative teaching and learning strategies
		promotion of reflective practice through counselling/process mode of INSET
		modelling and practice of new strategies
3.	Perceptions of culturally appropriate roles for teachers and learners	promotion of reflective practice
		diffusion of knowledge and awareness about barriers to innovation and about teacher effectiveness

4.	Fears and anxieties	'counselling' approach by teacher educators
5.	Intellectual doubts	promotion of reflective practice diffusion of knowledge.
6.	Limited professional competence	? subsumes all of the above?
7.	Limited linguistic competence	? growth of competence as a by-product of the above?

I have excluded management solutions from normal INSET provision. This seems to be a realistic recognition of the constraints within which teacher educators work, but it must be conceded that this exclusion represents a major defect in INSET provision, which is crucial in any evaluation of the effectiveness of INSET. A gloomy position would be to assume that any INSET provision that does not address management issues is fundamentally flawed. A more positive view would be to contend that INSET is essentially concerned with helping teachers to work in difficult circumstances despite the inevitable management problems.

Since I adopt a relatively more positive view, I see much of what teachers do as coping with difficulties. A coping style of teaching would have to be exemplified differently for each specific s ation, but we might define coping as finding ways of doing things less well than would be ideal, when the ideal is not available, rather than not doing them at all. Even such a modest formulation might come into question when we measure it against reality.

For instance, a coping style would try to bridge the gap between such ideal and real factors as the following:

	Ideal	**Real**
1.	group and pair work	large classes; noise frowned upon; fixed furniture; traditional expectations of teacher and learner roles
2.	errors seen as an aspect of language acquisition	tests, based on surface forms; competition for promotion; traditional attitudes
3.	need for extensive reading	no books: or books are stolen/locked up/ unsuitable/damaged
4.	teachers should keep up to date	no time; few opportunities; no rewards
5.	teachers should adapt the material to suit their own situations and the needs of the learners	centralised system; tradition of book learning; attitudes of inspectors

My view is that neither column contains absolutes. The ideal is not irreducible, and the problems are not insoluble. Coping solutions are often untidy and not

wholly satisfactory, and they require a degree of commitment and effort by teachers which are not commensurate with the tangible rewards. Nevertheless, in the absence of far-reaching and well resourced management solutions, coping solutions are the only alternative to deciding that nothing can be done - which presumably destroys the point of INSET.

Reflective practice I see as a necessary concomitant of a coping style of teaching. In this interpretation reflective practice is characterised by an attitude of mind by which the teacher seeks to bridge the gap between ideal and real, and which leads the teacher to plan, implement, and evaluate his/her work by asking questions such as 'What am I trying to achieve?', 'How can I achieve it?', 'How are the learners responding?', 'Could I do something different?', 'What should I do next?', 'Should I do this again?'.

I prefer to think of 'counselling' as 'a consultative style of teaching', largely because counselling proper comprises a set of professional therapeutic skills drawn from their fields, which most teacher educators cannot legitimately lay claim to. 'Counselling' might be a convenient shorthand term for such consultative behaviour as showing sympathy and understanding for teachers' problems, avoiding an up-front style of teaching, encouraging teachers to seek their own solutions, showing a concern for the affective dimension of teaching and learning, projecting a positive orientation, being accessible to contact from individual teachers, etc., etc.

A possible course model would be: description and analysis of the dominant paradigm constitute the **input** to the course. Course **process** is concerned with matching input against constraints and desiderata for successful innovation. Course **outcome** takes the form of specified and rationally argued proposals for feasible innovation in course members' own contexts.

Finally then, I see the need for ELT INSET course providers to move towards a more conscious articulation of the teacher education paradigm within which they work. In many respects we are still at an intuitive or pre-theoretical stage in the articulation of the paradigm, but I suggest that some elements are becoming clearer. Five of these are:

a) the concept of the teacher as a reflective practitioner

b) the concept of appropriate methodology, as a pattern of practice which emerges from the conflict between the ELT paradigm and the sets of constraints within which teachers work

c) a counselling/consultative role for teacher educators

d) foregrounding of the dominant paradigm

e) promotion of a style of teaching which encompasses coping with difficult circumstances within an understanding of and reflection on the dominant paradigm

It could be argued that while these components have their place, the real and hidden curriculum of UK-based INSET comprises extensive exposure to native-speaker English and the opportunity to participants to widen and deepen their educational and cultural experience in a way which is less specific than is implied

in the normal process of course design. Even if this is the case, however, and certainly the contrary has not been convincingly proved, it does not alter the argument. The claims of the dominant paradigm still make it incumbent on teacher educators to provide a rational and coherent articulation of the surface elements of course design in response to that paradigm, even though there is a strong possibility that the lasting effects may take place at the level of the hidden curriculum.

David Carver

Notes

1. For instance, I recently conducted a survey of English teachers from developing countries studying on a variety of courses at Moray House. I was interested to learn about course members' perceptions of what they saw as important recent developments in ELT methodology. Sixty-nine responses were classified as referring to communicative activities in the classroom. Respondents were asked to rate their responses on a four point scale, indicating their view of how easily the activities could be implemented in the classroom.

   The sixty-nine responses were analysed as follows:

Scale Point	No.
1 = activity could easily be implemented	14
2 = activity could be implemented with some difficulty	35
3 = it would be very difficult to implement the activity	16
4 = it would be impossible to implement the activity	1
No response	3
Total	69

2. I also carried out a survey of opinions of colleagues at Moray House, in order to get some insight into how they viewed the concept of appropriate methodology. Edited versions of their responses are listed in what follows.

Appropriate Methodology

A. Teachers have a sense of what is feasible. Appropriate methodology would pay more attention to resource-free teaching, and to what teachers could do better in their circumstances - this would take into account factors such as the text books and syllabuses in different countries, the learning styles in different countries, teachers' perceptions of their roles, and the examination requirements. This suggests that appropriate methodology would be based on homogeneous and country-specific grouping.

B. Appropriate methodology would include improved handling of basic techniques - e.g. drilling, use of texts, composition on the pattern of the 1960's and 1970's. It would also include supplementation of the textbook, and ways of handling the textbook in a flexible and more enlightened way. It also includes group and pair work, with reference to the limitation of resources. Teachers should recognize that they don't have to teach communicatively all the time - we mustn't overemphasise skill-using at the expense of skill-getting. Appropriate methodology must be based on the role of English in the society. Finally, appropriate methodology for English should use textbooks from the other subject areas.

C. Appropriate methodology is impossible unless courses are individualized. Moray House courses do not attempt to offer an appropriate methodology, but course members are given the opportunity to think about concerns in their own context - that is, the methodological outcome should be what the course members see as appropriate in their own contexts.

D. Moray House seeks to make course members aware of issues, and able to articulate problems. It is for individuals to seek solutions, or to consider whether there are solutions. Many course members do not get as far as this outcome but they learn to play this particular game. It is not always clear that solutions which are proposed are liable or appropriate.

E. We cannot determine what is an appropriate methodology for particular situations, but we can say that these are some things that people have done with success and these ways may be of interest to you. More specifically, we should offer ways of coping with the textbook plus possibilities of going beyond the textbook.

F. Appropriate methodology should include consideration of what standard of English is appropriate in different situations. Otherwise I don't think we can specify in advance what appropriate methodology should consist of. We should take more account of the background situation of specific groups or individuals. I'm not sure that there are general ELT concepts which individuals can take away and apply in their own contexts. I think the right approach is to start by asking what is possible rather than starting with assumptions about what the ideal methodology consists of.

G. I think it might be dangerous to spell out what appropriate methodology might be, because teachers might well reject it, and so we would end up by undermining our own authority. Some teachers don't want a modification of the existing situations; they want what they see as the new methods. Others, who are emerging from the situation are not anxious to look at the down-side; they want a well-funded first world version. I think we can approach appropriate methodology indirectly. We raise issues through case study, though we don't have the necessary experience. What we can best do is to train people in processes of rational decision-making. This is an educational process, whose value lies in the raising of consciousness and not in the particularity of solutions. However, it would be very useful if we had case studies of successful local adaptations so as to look at models of appropriate methodology.

H. Course members accept our authority, because of who we are, but we should give them more responsibility in deciding what is appropriate for them. They are aware of specific problems, but we should help them to ask fundamental questions, e.g. about needs and objectives, so as to give them an informed basis for making decisions about what is possible. We should aim to develop a critical attitude, so that they are disposed to ask questions and to seek their own solutions, which they are able to evaluate. Appropriate methodology is related to the idea of the reflective practitioner.

Bibliography

Ahrens, P (1986) "It wouldn't work in my classroom : an examination of some of the reasons teachers give for being unable to use communicative activities" (Focus on English - Madras 2.3 31-36)

Avalos, B (1985) Training for Better Teaching in the Third World (Teaching and Teacher Education 1.4 289-299)

Bolitho, R and Early, P (1981) "Reasons to be cheerful; or helping teachers to get problems into perspective" ELT Documents 110 : Focus on the Teacher. London : British Council

Bonamy, D and Moon, J (1981) "Some Strategies for Training ESP Teachers Overseas" (RELC Journal 12.2 7696)

Breen, M P (1987) "Contemporary Paradigms in Syllabus Design" State of the Art Article Parts I and II (Language Teaching 1987 pp 8192 and 157-174)

Brown, S and McIntyre, D (1982) Influences upon Teachers' Attitudes to Different Types of Innovation: A Study of Scottish Integrated Science (Curriculum Inquiry 12.1 35-51)

Doyle, W and G Ponder "The Practicality Ethic in Teacher Decision Making" (Interchange 8.3 1977 1-12)

Duffy, G and L Rochler (1986) 'Constraints on Teacher Change' (Journal of Teacher Education 3 7 55-8)

Joyce, B and Showers, B (1980) Improving Inservice Training : The Messages of Research - Educational Leadership 37 379-385

Kerry, T (1985) 'Barriers to, and pre-conditions for, innovation in primary teaching' (British Journal of Inservice Education 12.1 19-22)

Kuhn, T S (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (University of Chicago Press)

Maley, A (1984) "Constraints-based Syllabuses" in John A S Read (Ed) : Trends in Language Syllabus Design - RELC Anthology Series No 13 (Singapore University Press)

Medgyes, P (1986) "Queries from a Communicative Teacher" English Language Teaching Journal 40/2 : 107-112

Nahara, T (nd) "The Role of the Teacher and the Learner" (mimeo - from ELT training workshop conducted in Mozambique)

Nolasco, R and L Arthur (1986) "You try doing it with a class of forty!" English Language Teaching Journal 40/2 100-106

Rinvolucri, M (1981) Resistance to Change on Inservice Teacher Training Courses (Recherches et Echanges 6.1 45-52)

Rogan, J M and Macdonald, M A (1985) "The In-Service Teacher Education Component of an Innovation : A Case Study in an African Setting" (J. Curric. St. 17.1 63-85)

Schon, D (1983) The Reflective Practitioner : How Professionals Think in Action (Temple Smith)

Wigzell, R (1983) "The Role and Status of English as a Subject in the Zambian English-medium Context" (ELT Documents 116 - Language Teaching Projects for the Third World)